



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/595, 957	02/06/96	COLEY	C 025553-013

24M1/0918

EXAMINER

ELMORE, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2413

A

09/18/97

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined  Responsive to communication filed on \_\_\_\_\_  This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), \_\_\_\_\_ days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

**Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:**

1.  Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2.  Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3.  Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4.  Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5.  Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474..
6.  \_\_\_\_\_

**Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION**

1.  Claims 1-46 are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.
2.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.
3.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.
4.  Claims 1-11, 13-18, and 20-46 are rejected.
5.  Claims 12 and 19 are objected to.
6.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7.  This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8.  Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9.  The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are  acceptable;  not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10.  The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has (have) been  approved by the examiner;  disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11.  The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been  approved;  disapproved (see explanation).
12.  Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has  been received  not been received  been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
13.  Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14.  Other

**EXAMINER'S ACTION**

Art Unit: 2413

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-46 are presented for examination.

***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because:
  - a. they include certain reference signs not mentioned in the description. 37 CFR § 1.84(f) states, "Reference signs not mentioned in the description shall not appear in the drawing and vice versa." The following reference signs are not included in the description:
    - i. Fig. 3 -- 330;
    - b. they contain structural elements which are either not labeled, or merely labeled with nondescriptive reference characters. Since these elements are not illustrated as readily identifiable symbols, or well-known graphical representations, applicant is required to provide suitable descriptive legends under 37 CFR §§§ 1.83(a) and 1.84(n)-(o).

See 1.84(o) Legends, "suitable descriptive legends may be used or may be required by the Examiner, where necessary for understanding of the drawing".

In view of the above, Figure 3 contains the following elements which require descriptive legends:

- i. 306 -- e.g., public network;
- ii. 310 -- e.g., ISP;
- iii. 312 -- e.g., publicly accessible network;
- iv. 328 -- e.g., internal network;

Art Unit: 2413

c. according to 37 CFR § 1.83(a) "The drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature (emphasis added) of the invention specified in the claims". Therefore, the following features must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim:

- i. claims 1-3, 13, 20, 21 -- firewall box;
- ii. claim 1 -- firewall box is a stand alone computing platform;
- iii. claim 2 -- firewall box is dedicated to a firewall application;
- iv. claim 3 -- firewall box is a general purpose computer;
- v. claim 4 -- a plurality of proxy agents, each...being individually suited...in accordance with a port number...for verifying the incoming access request;
- vi. claim 9 -- communicates a second password...using an out of bands means...which second password is to be entered...to advance a logon process;
- vii. claim 10 -- the second password is a random number;
- viii. claim 11 -- the out of bands means is a beeper;
- ix. claim 13 -- proxy agent verifies that an incoming access request contains no executable commands directed to the firewall box;
- x. claim 16 -- proxy agent addresses the network element according to an alias;
- xi. claim 18 -- proxy agent operates in daemon mode;
- xii. claim 19 -- wherein the firewall system operates in a UNIX environment and the at least one proxy performs a Changeroot command prior to processing an incoming access request;

Art Unit: 2413

- xiii. claim 20 -- wherein an operating system of the firewall box performs packet filtering;
- xiv. claim 21 -- router performs packet filtering;
- xv. claim 22 -- a transaction log for recording information regarding an access request;
- xvi. claim 23 -- assigning a proxy agent to the incoming request in accordance with a port number indicated in the incoming access request;
- xvii. claim 23 -- using the proxy agent to form a connection to the network element;
- xviii. claim 24 -- wherein an assigned proxy agent is selected from a plurality of proxy agents, each of the plurality of proxy agents being individually suited, in accordance with a port number indicated in an incoming access request, for verifying the incoming access request;
- xix. claim 26 -- and using the at least one proxy agent to initiate a second set of verification checks in response to a second identified source
- xx. claim 30 -- using the at least one proxy agent to communicate a second password to the user using an out-of-band means, which second password is to be entered by the user to advance a logon process;
- xi. claim 31 -- wherein the second password is a random number;
- xxii. claim 32 -- wherein the out-of-bands means is a beeper;
- xxiii. claim 34 -- using the at least one proxy agent to verify that an incoming access request contains no executable commands;
- xxiv. claim 37 -- addressing the network element according to an alias;

Art Unit: 2413

- xxv. claim 38 -- the at least one proxy agent operates in a daemon mode;
- xxvi. claim 39 -- wherein the method is operates in a UNIX environment and the method further includes the step of: having the at least one proxy perform a Changeroot command prior to processing an incoming access request;
- xxvii. claim 40 -- performing packet filtering on the incoming access request;
- xxviii. claim 41 -- maintaining a transaction log for recording information regarding an access request;
- xxix. claim 42 -- wherein the firewall system runs on a stand alone computer connected between the network and the network element;
- xxx. claim 43 -- wherein the determining means is a proxy agent assigned to the incoming access request, in accordance with a port number indicated in the access request, to verify the authority of the source device to access the network element;
- xxxi. claim 44 -- assigning a proxy agent to the access request, based on a port number indicated within the access request, which proxy agent determines whether the first network element is authorized to access the second network element;
- xxxii. claim 46 -- an article of manufacture;
- xxxiii. claim 46 -- a stand alone firewall computer;
- xxxiv. claim 46 -- assign a proxy agent to the incoming access request, which assignment is performed in accordance with a port number associated with the incoming access request;

Art Unit: 2413

xxxv. claim 46 -- use the proxy agent to establish a connection between the computer and the network element on behalf of the incoming access request if the incoming access request is determined to be authorized.

Correction is required.

3. Formal correction of the noted defect(s) can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.
4. However, Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in response to this Office action. See 37 CFR 1.123 and MPEP 608.02(p).
5. Applicant is reminded of the requirement under MPEP 608.02(r) to submit a separate letter to the draftsman for any proposed drawing amendment.

### *Specification*

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In the Abstract,

- a. applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it uses the language "Methods and apparatus are disclosed" which can be implied. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Art Unit: 2413

In the specification,

- b. page 3, lines 18-19, the language "by hackers who may attempt reach systems beyond the Web server" is nonidiomatic English;
- c. page 21, line 8, the language "the hacker may be able to access to the files hierarchically" is nonidiomatic English;

Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Objections*

- 7. Claims 15, 27, 36, and 39 are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - a. claim 15, line 5 -- "a destination indicated an incoming access request" is improper English;
  - b. claim 27, line 11 -- "using the at least on proxy" is improper English;
  - c. claim 36, lines 3-5 -- "a destination indicated an incoming access request" is improper English;
  - d. claim 39, lines 12-13 -- "the method is operates" is improper English.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

- 8. Claims 4, 9-11, and 23-41 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are indefinite because:

- a. the following claims include terms or phrases which lack proper antecedent basis:

Art Unit: 2413

- i. claim 4, lines 18-19 -- "the firewall application";
- b. the following claims use the word "means" improperly:
  - i. claims 9, 11, 30, 32 -- "out-of-band means";
  - ii. claim 23 -- "verification means";

this usage is an improper use of the word "means" in the claim language. 35 USC § 112, 6th paragraph, authorizes use of "means" language in the claims only as follows;

"An element in a claim for a combination may be expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof..."

However, in this instance, no function is specified to be performed.

c. further as to claim 4, as to the language "each of the plurality of proxy agents being individually suited...for verifying the incoming access request", the relevant terminology "being...suited...for verifying" appears to suggest the *capability* for performing the activity "verifying", however, in view of the following,

Note: *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138. "it has been held that the recitation that an element is "capable of" performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense.

one of ordinary skill in the art would consider the language to be indefinite as to whether or not a "verifying" activity is positively performed in the claimed limitation;

d. claims 10, 24-29, 31, and 33-41 -- inherit the deficiencies of the preceding claim in the claim dependency chain.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 USC 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 2413

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

10. Claims 1-8, 14-18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Vu, US Patent 5,623,606.

Vu teaches a firewall system for protecting a network element from access over a network to which the network element is attached (as per claim 1), the firewall system comprising:

- a. Vu teaches a firewall box, see gateway station, element 14, Fig. 4, and corresponding col. 7, line 63 - col. 8, line 5;
- b. Vu teaches a first connection connecting the network to the firewall box, the left connection to element 14 from the public network, Fig. 4;
- c. Vu teaches a second connection connecting the firewall box to the network element, the right connection to element 14 from the private network, Fig. 4;
- d. Vu teaches at least one proxy agent running on the firewall box for verifying that an access request packet received over the first connection is authorized to access the network element, the at least one proxy agent initiating a connection to the network element on behalf of the access request if the access request is authorized (e.g., see col. 8, line 50 - col. 12, line 19, and particularly note col. 9, lines 53-54, "these processes are called "proxies""');
- e. Vu teaches wherein the firewall box is a stand alone computing platform (e.g., see col. 6, lines 19-21);
- f. as to claims 2 and 3, Vu teaches wherein the firewall box is dedicated to a firewall application and wherein the firewall box is a general purpose computer (see e.g., col. 6, lines 15-21, "configured as a...firewall" and "a UNIX station");

Art Unit: 2413

g. as to claim 4, Vu teaches wherein the firewall application comprises a plurality of proxy agents, each of the plurality of proxy agents being individually suited, in accordance with a port number indicated in an incoming access request, for verifying the incoming access request (see e.g., col. 9, line 65 - col. 10, line 19 and lines 40-45, and col. 11, lines 1-4);

h. as to claim 5, Vu teaches wherein the at least one proxy agent verifies that a source address associated with an incoming access request is authorized to access the network element (see e.g., col. 11, lines 1-4);

i. as to claims 6, 7, and 8, Vu teaches wherein the at least one proxy agent verifies that a user associated with an incoming access request is authorized to access the network element and wherein the at least one proxy agent prompts the user to enter a user name and verifies the user name entered, and wherein the at least one proxy agent prompts the user to enter a user name and a password and verifies the user name and password entered (see e.g., col. 11, lines 35-41);

j. as to claim 14, Vu teaches wherein the at least one proxy agent verifies that a destination associated with an incoming access request is valid (see e.g., col. 11, line 14);

k. as to claim 15, Vu teaches further to claim 14 wherein the at least one proxy agent verifies that a destination indicated an incoming access request is valid for a user associated with the incoming access request (see e.g., col. 11, lines 47-50);

l. as to claim 16, Vu teaches wherein the at least one proxy agent addresses the network element according to an alias (see e.g., col. 11, line 66 - col. 12, line 7) where it is *inherent* that an alias is used by the proxy to establish the transparent communication;

m. as to claim 17, Vu teaches wherein the at least one proxy agent manages the connection to the network element (see e.g., col. 9, lines 50-53);

Art Unit: 2413

n. as to claim 18, Vu teaches wherein the at least one proxy agent operates in a daemon mode as *inherent* to the basic functionality of a UNIX system since, under UNIX, a daemon is a program (proxy) which performs a utility function without being requested or even known of by the user, and sits in the background and is called into play only when needed, from

**Microsoft Press "Computer Dictionary, 2nd ed., 1994 - daemon;**

o. as to claim 20, Vu teaches wherein an operating system of the firewall box performs packet filtering, col. 4, lines 22-44;

p. as to claim 21, Vu teaches a router attached between the firewall box and the public network, which router performs packet filtering, see element 20, Fig. 4;

q. as to claim 22, Vu teaches a transaction log for recording information regarding an access request as inherent to authentication files, col. 13, lines 48-51.

11. Claims 23-25, 27-29, and 35-41 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Vu; US Patent 5,623,606.

Vu teaches a firewall method for protecting a network element from unauthorized access over a network to which the network element is attached (as per claim 23), the method comprising the steps of:

a. Vu teaches receiving an incoming access request (see e.g., col. 7, line 63 - col. 8, line 54);

b. Vu teaches thereafter assigning a proxy agent to the incoming access request in accordance with a port number indicated in the incoming access request (see e.g., col. 9, line 65 - col. 10, line 19);

Art Unit: 2413

c. Vu teaches verifying the authority of the incoming access request to access the protected network element by using the proxy agent as a verification means (see e.g., col. 11, lines 18-36);

d. Vu teaches thereafter using the proxy agent to form a connection to the network element on behalf of the incoming access request if the authority of the incoming access request is verified (see e.g., col. 11, lines 52-65);

e. as to claim 24, Vu teaches wherein an assigned proxy agent is selected from a plurality of proxy agents, each of the plurality of proxy agents being individually suited, in accordance with a port number indicated in an incoming access request, for verifying the incoming access request (see e.g., col. 9, line 65 - col. 10, line 19 and lines 40-45, and col. 11, lines 1-4);

f. as to claim 25, VU teaches wherein the step of verifying the authority of the incoming access request includes: using the at least one proxy agent to verify that a source address associated with an incoming access request is authorized to access the network element (see e.g., col. 11, lines 1-4);

g. as to claims 27, 28, and 29, Vu teaches wherein the step of verifying the authority of the incoming access request includes: using the at least one proxy agent to verify that a user associated with an incoming access request is authorized to access the network element, teaches wherein the method of claim 27 further comprises the steps of: using the at least one proxy agent to prompt the user to enter a user name; and verifying the authority of the user name entered, and teaches the method of claim 27, wherein the method further comprises the steps of: using the at least one proxy agent to prompt the user to enter a user name and a password; and verifying the authority of the user name and password entered (see e.g., col. 11, lines 35-41);

Art Unit: 2413

h. as to claim 35, Vu teaches wherein the step of verifying the authority of the incoming access request includes: using the at least one proxy agent to verify that a destination associated with an incoming access request is valid (see e.g., col. 11, line 14);

i. as to claim 36, Vu teaches wherein the step of verifying the authority of the incoming access request includes: using the at least one proxy agent to verify that a destination indicated an incoming access request is valid for a user associated with the incoming access request (see e.g., col. 11, lines 47-50);

j. as to claim 37, Vu teaches wherein the step of: using the proxy agent to form a connection to the network element on behalf of the incoming access request includes: addressing the network element according to an alias (see e.g., col. 11, line 66 - col. 12, line 7) where it is *inherent* that an alias is used by the proxy to establish the transparent communication;

k. as to claim 38, Vu teaches wherein the at least one proxy agent operates in a daemon mode as *inherent* to the basic functionality of a UNIX system since, under UNIX, a daemon is a program (proxy) which performs a utility function without being requested or even known of by the user, and sits in the background and is called into play only when needed, from Microsoft Press "Computer Dictionary, 2nd ed., 1994 - *daemon*";

l. as to claim 40, Vu teaches wherein the method further includes the step of performing packet filtering on the incoming access request (see e.g., col. 4, lines 22-44);

m. as to claim 41, Vu teaches maintaining a transaction log for recording information regarding an access request as inherent to authentication files, col. 13, lines 48-51.

12. Claims 42, 43, and 45 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Vu, US Patent 5,623,606.

Art Unit: 2413

Vu teaches a firewall system for protecting a network element from access over a network to which the network element is connected (as per claim 42), and firewall process (as per claim 45) for operating a computer connected between a network and a network element to protect the network element from unauthorized access over the network, the firewall system and process comprising:

- a. Vu teaches a means for (and step of) receiving an access request from a source device over the network (see e.g., col. 9, line 41 - col. 10, line 23);
- b. Vu teaches a means for (and step of) determining whether the source device is authorized to access the network element (see e.g., col. 11, lines 1-56);
- c. Vu teaches a means for (and step of) establishing a connection to the network element on behalf of the source device in the event that the source device is authorized to access the network element (see e.g., col. 11, line 46 - col. 12, line 19);
- d. Vu teaches wherein the firewall system runs on a stand alone computer connected between the network and the network element (see e.g., col. 6, lines 19-21);
- e. as to claim 43, Vu teaches wherein the determining means is a proxy agent assigned to the incoming access request, in accordance with a port number indicated in the access request, to verify the authority of the source device to access the network element (see e.g., col. 11, lines 1-41).

13. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Vu, US Patent 5,623,606.

Vu teaches a method for controlling a computer to act as a firewall for protecting a first network element from unauthorized access through a second network element over a network to which the first network element is attached, the method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2413

- a. Vu teaches receiving an access request to access the first network element at the computer (see e.g., col. 9, line 41 - col. 10, line 23);
- b. Vu teaches assigning a proxy agent to the access request, based on a port number indicated within the access request, which proxy agent determines whether the first network element is authorized to access the second network element (see e.g., col. 9, line 65 - col. 10, line 19) and (see e.g., col. 11, lines 18-36);
- c. Vu teaches using the proxy agent to establish a connection between the first and second network elements on behalf of the second network element if it is determined that the second network element is authorized to access the first network element (see e.g., col. 11, lines 52-65).

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

14. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 USC 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 USC 103© and potential 35 USC 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 USC 103(a).

15. The following is a quotation of 35 USC 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2413

16. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vu, US Patent 5,623,606 in view of Shwed, US Patent 5,606,668.

Vu teaches the firewall system as noted above para. 10(a)-(e), however, does not teach wherein the at least one proxy agent verifies that an incoming access request contains no executable commands directed to the firewall box, but Shwed does teach this limitation, col. 9, line 64 - col. 10, line 65, where Telnet services are disallowed in the system, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the system of Shwed into the system of Vu because Vu suggests such implementation, col. 9, lines 4-11, as "data checking" to improve security by e.g., prevent protocol piggybacking.

17. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vu, US Patent 5,623,606 in view of Shwed, US Patent 5,606,668.

Vu teaches the firewall method as noted above para. 11(a)-(d), however, does not teach wherein the at least one proxy agent verifies that an incoming access request contains no executable commands directed to the firewall box, but Shwed does teach this limimtation, col. 9, line 64 - col. 10, line 65, where Telnet services are disallowed in the system, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the system of Shwed into the system of Vu because Vu suggests such implementation, col. 9, lines 4-11, as "data checking" to improve secuirty by e.g., prevent protocol piggybacking.

18. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vu, US Patent 5,623,606.

Vu, as noted in para. 13 above with respect to corresponding independent claim 44, teaches a method for controlling a computer to act as a firewall for protecting a first network element from unauthorized access through a second network element over a network to which

Art Unit: 2413

the first network element is attached, but, does not explicitly teach the claimed article of manufacture for use in a stand alone firewall computer to isolate a network element from unauthorized access over a network to which the network element is attached, comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means for causing the computer to perform the following activities corresponding to the method steps of independent claim 44, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of independent claim 44 (or implement the computer steps of) by placing computer readable program code (representing the method) on a computer readable medium to form an article of manufacture (i.e., a program on a disk) which cause the computer to perform (when run on a computer) the claimed activities, because this modification (the article of manufacture) would obviously improve the invention (make more useful) by enhancing distribution (enable more wide distribution, enable less costly distribution, and thereby enable ease of distribution) of the invention to a greater number of (or larger market of) computers, where the claimed activities are taught in view of such modification of Vu as follows (i.e, an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means for causing a computer to...):

- i. receive an incoming access request transmitted over the network (see e.g., col. 9, line 41 - col. 10, line 23);
- ii. assign a proxy agent to the incoming access request, which assignment is performed in accordance with a port number associated with the incoming access request (see e.g., col. 9, line 65 - col. 10, line 19);
- iii. use the proxy agent to determine whether the incoming access request is authorized to access the network element (see e.g., col. 11, lines 18-36); and

Art Unit: 2413

- iv. use the proxy agent to establish a connection between the computer and the network element on behalf of the incoming access request if the incoming access request is determined to be authorized (see e.g., col. 11, lines 52-65).

*Allowable Subject Matter*

19. Claims 12 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
20. Claims 9-11, 26, and 30-33 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 USC 112 set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

*Conclusion*

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Elmore whose telephone number is (703) 305-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 730AM-600PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel, Jr., can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-9724.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 2400 Receptionist at (703) 305-3800.

23. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2413

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry, please label  
"FORMAL" and sign as attorney of record)

**Or:**

(703) 305-9724 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal  
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

SCE  
September 11, 1997



PHUNG CHUNG  
PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2400